20c SEPTEMBER 8, 1952

STALIN REPAINTS THE FACADE—page 16

New Republic

WHO IS RICHARD NIXON?

SEP 3 1952

The Charles C. Sherrod Library
EAST TENNESSEE STATE COLLEGE
Johnson City, Tennessee

WILL McCARTHY SUPPORT EISENHOWER?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letters

The 1952 Campaign

● Your article "Reflections on the Eisenhower-Stevenson Campaign" (*NR*, August 11) in my judgment contains many assumptions that seem to be unwarranted.

You greatly disparage the argument that "its time for a change" . . . but it must not be forgotten that many citizens are greatly concerned about the trend to centralized power in Washington; that 22 million persons cast their ballots for Dewey in 1948, and that the evidence of the evils of vast power are evident in the nation's capitol . . .

. . . Comparing the board of the US Steel Corporation to the government and stating that it does not seem reasonable to replace the board of the former periodically is somewhat an untenable position to assume. For one thing, the cold logic of economic life governs a steel company and any tendency to monopolize its business field is subject to check by our anti-trust laws; on the other hand the government is not tightly bound by economic laws since it can go on living beyond its means as long as it stays in office or the country goes bankrupt.

You state that government is a serious and skilled profession, which is fine in theory, but in practice something else entirely. It would be preposterous to say that a government is serious and skilled when it numbers 2.5 million in workers, when the cost of itself is more in time of peace than in time of war, when about one out of every nine citizens receives some sort of government check, when the government debt stands at $225 billion, when the national tax bill for the year is more than the nation's food bill for the year, and when the country suffers casualties numbering 105,000 in a "police action" entered into by that government in spite of the restraint of the nation's constitution. If ever there is a confirmation of Sir John Acton's statement — that "power corrupts; absolute power corrupts absolutely"—the present Democratic Administration offers good evidence. Twenty years of power entrenches an administration so deeply that it is extremely doubtful that a mere change of the leadership of that administration will root out the imbedded sloth.

You state that 20 years of opposition has left the Republican Party lacking in ability to govern. . . . That is similar to the local politician running for re-election who says not to vote for the opposing man because he will have to be trained in the office, but instead vote for me because I already have the training. You forget that 25 states had Republican governors in 1951 and that all during the 20 years of "political exile" there were always Republican governors.

You state the Republican Party speaks gloomily of a "static economy" and "crushing tax burdens of welfare, armaments and overseas aid." You altogether overlook the possibility that the Republicans are criticizing "method," not the ultimate goal of our foreign policy. The spending of gigantic sums of money is always fraught with danger and should constantly be examined, but this has not been done. Our foreign aid has totaled (sic) about $100 billion and we have spent billions on our defense establishment, but we find no great evidence of success of foreign policy in the troubled spots of the world and we find ourselves without a first-rate air force or army. The Republican Party desires just as much as the Democratic Party to relieve the suffering and fear of war in foreign lands, but this must be done in an intelligent manner that at least gives some chance of success without radically impairing the economic pulse beat of America. The trend to military assistance in our foreign-aid program—and a departure from the Marshall Plan idea—carries with it certain dangers that must be recognized. Military assistance is not self-liquidating and is maintained by the taxpaying resources of the government. This brings to mind Talleyrand's famous remark of 150 years ago to his chief, Napoleon, "You can do anything with bayonets, sir, except sit on them." War machines and war economies do not stand still.

You state that a program to lighten these burdens is "sterile" and "unsound," without considering that some thought must be given for the American taxpayer who makes our government spending and lending possible. Any program of giving assistance, no matter how highly motivated, must be practical and give heed to the resources of the taxpayer and any impairment of his productivity must be avoided, because only by non-impairment can the amount of aid over the long term be assured.

You state that the restrictionist concept of the Republican Party will bring about Socialism. It seems to me that you ignore the historical fact that Socialism has invariably been spawned in the initial efforts of the central government to assume all power unto itself. . . . The Republican Party does not believe in restrictive bonds on our economy; it believes in expanding the economy, but it sees no solution of the problems by injecting into the economy more and more armament inflation. Moreover, it fears that the concentration of power for so many years in the hands of one party tends to drive that party to a Socialistic program. Expansion by defense production is not a solution to our problems; it only postpones that solution.

Your statement that the contrast between our income growth of three percent each year compared to the one percent each year of the remainder of the free world constitutes a source of propaganda strength to the Communists and because of this we should share our bounty. This seems to carry an apologetic note, a feeling that we should be ashamed of our marvelous economic growth. . . . You overlook the fact that every American wants to aid unfortunate peoples, not because his income is so much more than that of others, but because in his heart he feels compelled to help others—because he feels he is his brother's keeper. This is the only reason for aid to the world and I am sure all sincere Americans of both Democrat and Republican faith feel this way.

Tulsa, Oklahoma W. ROBERT AWENIUS

● At long last TRB has revealed that he, too, is human.

In the July 21 *NR* he terms the nomination of the relatively politically unknown, Eisenhower, as the real anomaly of the Republican Convention. There is nothing unreal connected with the nomi-

(Continued on page 4)

Bandwagon

Rain Check

Samuel R. Guard, editor of *Breeders' Gazette*, planned to speak on the drought today but changed his mind when it rained. – *From an AP dispatch in the Louisville* Courier-Journal.

The Spirit of '52

"Even the children in the block got into the spirit of the thing. They have a new game which consists in running as fast as possible, screaming as loud as possible, for as long as possible. It is called 'Running for Congress'." – *From the* Ladies' Home Journal.

New Serum

ARGENTINA TO BAR DOCTORS UNLESS POLITICALLY INJECTED
– *From the New York* Times.

Our readers are invited to contribute; $2 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, c/o New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. – The Editors.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Republic

CONTENTS FOR SEPT. 8, 1952

5 Will McCarthy Support Eisenhower? An Editorial

7 The Week:

7 Racetracks as Usual

7 Stabilization Shifts

7 The Legion and the ACLU

8 Italy: Anchor of Defense?

9 II. Who Is Richard Nixon?

12 Goodbye to Springfield, by William V. Shannon

13 The Undue Process of Passports, by Eugene Gressman

16 Stalin Repaints the Facade, by Samuel L. Sharp

18 Literature and the Arts:

18 H. Guderian, *Panzer Leader*, by Thomas Phillips

19 W. W. Rostow, *The Process of Economic Growth*, by G. Soule

20 Materials and Weights of Hermann Melville, by C. Olson

21 E. Mounier, *Personalism*, by Irving Jaffe

22 What is Atonality? by Robert Evett

EDITOR: Michael Straight
CHAIRMAN, Editorial Board: Bruce Bliven
PUBLISHER: Daniel Mebane
MANAGING EDITOR: Helen Fuller
LITERARY EDITOR: Robert Richman
REPORTERS: Jean Begeman, Arnold J. Heidenheimer
CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Eric Bentley, Malcolm Cowley, Robert Evett
CONTRIBUTING CRITICS: W. H. Auden, Nicola Chiaramonte, Harold Clurman, Dudley Fitts, Kimon Friar, Gerald Johnson, V. O. Key, Max Lerner, Richard Lester, James R. Newman, Kathleen Raine, John Crowe Ransom, Herbert Read, Mark Schorer, James Johnson Sweeney, Robert Penn Warren
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: F. R. Ruskin
COPY ASSISTANT: Lucille Davis

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1952 IN THE USA BY WESTBURY PUBLICATIONS, INC., PUBLISHING OFFICE 301 N ST., N.E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C. EDITORIAL COMMUNICATIONS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO 1416 F ST, N.W., WASHINGTON 4, D. C. BUSINESS COMMUNICATIONS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO 40 EAST 49TH ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y. ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER SEPTEMBER 26, 1950, AT THE POST OFFICE AT WASHINGTON, D. C., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1877. SINGLE COPY, 20c; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, $6.50; CANADA AND FOREIGN, $7.50. PRINTED IN THE USA.

WASHINGTON WIRE

As ANYONE can see who knows how to read between the lines of Republican newspapers, Stevenson has got off to a brilliant start and Ike to a very bad start. We have a hunch Stevenson is going to beat Ike in November but, in all candor, it is too soon to say. That is because the real battle is only beginning. On form, Stevenson has it all over Ike to date, but speeches of both men have been clothed in generalities. Now after Labor Day the real battle starts, sparring changes to slugging, and proposals become specific.

As we watch Stevenson he seems almost too good to be true. He has dry wit, courage and audacity. He took the right stand on the tidelands oil issue. He faced the American Legion and smilingly told them where they got off—and got away with it. His position on civil rights sounds pretty good. We keep fearing Adlai will not be liberal enough. We respect and admire New York *Times*man James Reston and notice his personal estimate of August 24 that Stevenson is "to the Right of the New Deal, further to the Right than most people realize." Well, we wonder. Some months back Reston wrote that "the General was decisive and the Governor indecisive." Reston now admits that judgment was premature, and maybe he is wrong about the new one.

The facts of civilization call for liberalism in America. The voters are ripe for it, and it woud be personal folly and national tragedy if Stevenson followed what the station-wagon set call a "moderate" policy. He will find out the facts of life fast enough when and if he gets to Washington. Even Taft was called "Socialistic" by the real-estate lobby. So far our apprehension about Adlai is contradicted by virtually everything he's said or done, we are glad to report. His personal campaign manager, Wilson Wyatt, is a first-rate liberal. And when we muse over the difference between the rival headquarters, we contrast the selection of two relatively minor characters. To help him in speech-writing Adlai picked the brilliant liberal Arthur Schlesinger Jr. of Harvard, while Ike picked Stanley High of *Readers' Digest*. Somehow that tells the story. Go through the last half-dozen years and read the High pieces. It would make a nice research project in itself. Now the estimable (and likeable) Mr. High is doing his best to give us a *Readers' Digest* President. We have a feeling the voter isn't as much afraid of social progress as the *Readers' Digest* is.

At the moment the big mystery of the campaign is John Foster Dulles. Does he speak for Ike in his denunciation of "containment" and in his demand for a more aggressive policy that is scaring the daylights out of Europe? He says he does and has not been contradicted. It is reported he ghost-wrote the forthcoming Eisenhower foreign-policy speech for Philadelphia. He wrote the GOP key platform phrase calling the Truman-Acheson containment policy "negative, futile and immoral." (Parenthetically, this recalls that the New York *Times*' detailed editorial analysis, praising the foreign-policy plank, never mentioned this crucial phrase. The *Times* sprang to endorse Ike without waiting to see who the Democrats would nominate; a silly procedure it seemed to us for a great independent newspaper. Now they are stuck with him, though their European correspondents warn of the harm his foreign-policy comments are doing.)

We happen to know that Truman is going to lash out at Ike-Dulles shortly on the foreign-policy issue. Neither Ike nor Dulles have specifically advocated using US military force to liberate satellite countries, though they imply it. What Ike actually told the Legion in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New York was that the US could never rest until the satellite nations were freed, and that the US would never refuse "aid" to those people behind the Iron Curtain seeking liberation. Just what does it mean? Are we going to foment insurrections activity, underwrite guerrilla war, use NATO's army as an offensive weapon? Will this not invite repetition of the wartime Warsaw massacres when the city rebelled in expectation of prompt aid and failed to get it? Ike is too big a man to engage in demagoguery on foreign policy. But could it be that he is so unfamiliar with domestic politics as to have been sold a bill of goods by a man desperately intent on becoming Secretary of State—first an adviser of Taft and now of Ike himself? The matter is rapidly becoming the most interesting in the campaign.

The great virtue which Adlai seems to possess is the ability to take a tough problem and make the common man understand what he is saying without condescending. Truman has done many fine things in foreign affairs, but he has only partly succeeded in carrying the masses along with him. They have intuitively trusted his good intentions, but he has failed time and again to make them understand the problems and the impossibility of finding easy panaceas.

It seems to us that Adlai has that heaven-given power and can bring greater unity on foreign affairs. FDR "chatted" with the nation in fireside talks; Stevenson's voice seemed to many at first almost too highbrow and cultivated, but it appears that his mannerisms are not offensive judging by his triumph at the Legion convention, perhaps because he seasons his talk with wit and humor, expresses his ideas in razor-sharp phrases, and at heart is a compassionate and humble man.

Notes: TRB (July 21): McCarthy "made a good, straight, down-the-middle-of-the gutter address;" Stevenson, August 28: (of McCarthy) "those who favor what has been described as the middle-of-the-gutter approach."

Washington T.R.B.

CORRESPONDENCE

(Continued from page 2)

nation of the former General when we consider that less than 50 percent of the potential voters voted in the past Presidential election, and that they exercise very little control over the few men who select the nominee from behind the scenes, the Republican delegates voted for Eisenhower because they felt that of the men proposed he stood the best chance of winning. From the point of view of practical politics (who are we to tell the Republicans who is best), there was no irregularity in the decision made at Chicago.

Although from his vantage point TRB may be startled by the persistent wrongheadedness of some members of the fourth estate, the attitudes of the latter group are easily understood by many laymen like myself. If those he speaks of listen only to those whose thoughts are similar to their own and discount the ideas of those who share different views, it is no wonder that they go off on a tangent from sound thought. Also remember that the attitudes often help one to maintain a comfortable job.

Notwithstanding the tremendous effort sure to be put forth by the great majority of the press on behalf of Eisenhower, it may be, to quote roughly from TRB, that "the voters will heave a long sigh and vote Democratic once again." Inertia will apparently serve liberalism, for once. . . .

Cleveland Heights, Ohio LAWRENCE GOULD

Golden Bowling

● "Everyone must be grateful to the Grove Press for making *The Golden Bowl* available (even at $6.50). . . ."

So your reviewer begins his pean (*NR*, August 18, 1952) assignment for any novel reader.

Noting that the book has been printed from "Scribner's old plates," it seems to me your reviewer might profitably discuss the reason why a book so manufactured, by an author long out of royalties, from plates nearly 50 years old, has so astronomical a price. Of course the reviewer got *his* copy for free, and I have often noted a certain genteel reluctance of such gentry to make any vulgar allusion to the unpredictable antics of publishers as to price. Personally I do not see "everyone" rushing to pay six and a half dollars for a book so produced. I will tell you why. I happen to own *The Wings Of The Dove*, printed from Scribner plates and it is a somewhat scrubby job, resembling the sort of thing one pays 50 cents for in a second-hand store.

This is a matter I have never seen handled by reviewers except myself. What is the system, or principle, if I am not misusing the language, by which one book, often a good one, costs $3; another, no different, costs $3.75; another, not so good, and by a dead author, $4.50; and yet another, by an unreadable European master, $5? Your reviewer implies that "everyone" will be dancing in the streets over this new reprint. I doubt if one tenth of one-half percent of the reading public would ever get through that murky masterpiece. Henry James is a cult, but you will never get the cultists to admit it. You will never get them to submit to a poll of the reading public. You will never find any college lad doing a thesis on the *sales* of Henry James's novels.

Roxbury, Conn. WILLIAM MCFEE

Sen. Edward Thye

● Your article entitled "Knights and Knaves in Eisenhower's Great Crusade" (*NR*, July 28) lists Sen. Edward J. Thye, Republican, now a candidate for re-election in Minnesota, as a liberal and internationalist.

Senator Thye cannot be called a liberal by any stretch of the imagination unless you also consider the former Republican Senator from Minnesota, Joe Ball, a liberal. Senator Thye voted for the Taft-Hartley Law and to override the President's veto of it. He supported every crippling amendment to price control.

He favors state control of tidelands oil. He supported the Senate Rule 22 which makes the termination of a filibuster impossible, and he has also opposed public power on six key votes in the past few years, according to the roll-call chart of the National Electric Co-operative Association. For good measure, I might mention that Senator Thye also voted to override the President's veto of the non-liberal McCarran Immigration Bill.

Louis Bean, political analyst, writing in the June *Harper's*, lists Senator Thye as one of seven Republicans whose chance of re-election is in considerable doubt.

St. Paul, Minn. WILLIAM E. CARLSON

Congratulations

● Congratulations on your series of articles on the Baroque (*NR*, July 28, August 4, August 11). As a friend and pupil of Piston and a friend and close student of Palmer, I am naturally very pleased to see their work so highly valued and eloquently defended. And I think you're essentially right about Hindemith too, although I differ with you when you speak of "the perfection of his surfaces," and believe that you could defend him better if you would discriminate patiently between those works where he achieves perfection and those where he doesn't . . .

Ithaca, N. Y. WILLIAM AUSTIN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOLUME 127, NUMBER 10, ISSUE 1971, WASHINGTON, D. C., SEPTEMBER 8, 1952

New Republic

WILL McCARTHY SUPPORT EISENHOWER?

WILL EISENHOWER support McCarthy? We might better ask *will McCarthy support Eisenhower?* For if McCarthy is re-elected he will gain veto power over the administration of the State Department under Eisenhower. He will gain this power as Chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee that passes on all State Department expenditures.

What this would mean for Eisenhower's Secretary of State can be seen from a few excerpts from the 2,000 pages of star-chamber proceedings held by the subcommittee this year.

All files must be submitted to McCarthy.

That is made clear by the exchanges between McCarthy and Assistant Secretary of State Carlisle Humelsine on the loyalty case of Edmund Clubb.

McCarthy: . . . is it your position that you will be allowed to tell the committee what the Loyalty Board did . . . and why the case was reversed and when? . . .

Humelsine: It is my position that I will not be able to tell you all of the steps in the loyalty process.

McCarthy: Don't give me that double talk. . . .

Humelsine: That is not double talk. . . .

McCarthy: . . . is it your position that you will be able to give the information?

Humelsine: No, sir. I understand that I cannot.

McCarran: Why?

Humelsine: Because I am not permitted to . . . by regulation.

McCarthy: . . . that is information we must have . . . the Chair should consider ordering Mr. Humelsine to give the information regardless of what he thinks the interpretation of the Presidential order is. . . . I intend to move . . . that Mr. Humelsine be forced to give us all the cases of individuals who resigned as a result of security or loyalty investigations and who are now receiving pensions or any type of aid or assistance of any kind from the government. . . . If that is not given we should take steps which the committee can do to rectify it.

Later 54 loyalty cases were discussed.

McCarthy: . . . Mr. Chairman . . . the committee should ask for the names of the 54 who resigned while they were under loyalty investigation. . . . We should follow the usual procedure when a witness refuses to give information.

McCarran: What do you mean by that?

McCarthy: . . . he should be found in contempt.

McCarthy must have powers of veto.

That is made clear by McCarthy's willingness to attach riders to State Department appropriations to cut off any one he does not like.

McCarthy: . . . it becomes very important to us to know the facts in the Clubb case and to know why it was reversed if we are going to appropriate money to pay his annuity. . . . I personally would certainly vote against any annuity for Mr. Clubb unless there is some justification for the reversal [of the loyalty findings].

McCarthy must run the loyalty program.

McCarthy: What has happened to the Brunauer case?

Humelsine: . . . her case is still under consideration.

McCarthy: . . . why has it taken about a year? . . . the witness should be ordered to tell us and should give us that information, Mr. Chairman.

Humelsine: May I interrupt to say. . . .

McCarthy: Listen to me. . . . You understand that you are asking us for money to run this program.

Humelsine: I understand that.

McCarthy: I am going to have difficulty trying to pass this appropriation unless I know how efficient or inefficient your organization is. . . . Now if you do not tell us. . . . I am going to vote to cut off the funds.

Later this exchange took place.

McCarthy: . . . there is a suspicion on the part of some including myself that you hold some of these cases indefinitely. . . .

Humelsine: Yes sir.

McCarthy: Every other Department . . . has done a much better job getting rid of their disloyal people. . . . Up until the time this memorandum was prepared you had not found a single person disloyal. The department with the next worst record was the Commerce Department. They found over six percent of their cases disloyal.

Humelsine: . . . we are not running this thing on the basis of a statistical record. What we are trying to do is to run an honest straightforward program.

McCarthy: Carlisle, would you say that the Review Board is a fairly good judge? . . .

(McCarthy then produced secret minutes from the Central Review Board adding, "They have been searching trying to find out how the members of the Congress got the minutes.")

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There must be no public criticism of McCarthy.

Gen. Conrad E. Snow, Republican chairman of the State Department Loyalty Board defined McCarthyism in a speech as "the making of baseless accusations regarding the loyalty and integrity of public officers."

McCarthy: Mr. Snow, you have been using a term which was coined by Owen Lattimore and first published by the *Daily Worker* and constantly used by the *Daily Worker.* The term is McCarthyism.

Ferguson: . . . you made a speech on that . . . did you?

Snow: Yes, sir.

McCarran: Where did you get the right to revile a member of the Senate of the United States? Where did you get that authority?

Snow: I am a citizen of the United States, and I am engaged in public office.

McCarran: You ought to be out of that office.

Snow: When Senators make on the public platform statements which impugn the operation of my public office I have the right to reply to them.

McCarran: Publicly?

Snow: Publicly.

McCarthy: Who prepared the speech?

Snow: I did.

McCarthy: You mean you did all of the work yourself?

Snow: All . . . except that I relied on my attorney. . . .

McCarthy: Your Loyalty Security Board counsel helped you prepare it.

Snow: Yes.

Ferguson: And he was on the public payroll?

Snow: Oh, yes.

McCarthy: How many hours did you spend on preparing this speech?

Snow: . . . I stayed in on Saturday and Sunday and worked on it.

Ferguson: Who typed this speech! May I get that in the record.

Snow: My own stenographer.

McCarthy: How much time would it take off from the duties of the lawyer and the stenographer to help prepare the speech.

Snow: I worked nights and Saturday . . . and Sunday. . . .

McCarthy: I am anxious to know whether this was sent to all of the dailies and weeklies. If so . . . this would cost a lot in terms of postage. I am just wondering how much money was spent by the Department and what funds that came from.

Humelsine: . . . we did it in the Department of State at the cost of $18.

There must be no private criticism of McCarthy.

In March, 1951, several churches held a seminar in Washington. They held one afternoon session at the State Department.

McCarthy: Mr. Chairman . . . the State Department . . . wrote to the leaders of the Congregational Church. And they invited them to attend a so-called secret briefing. . . . The briefing consisted of a program exclusively devoted to a vicious attack upon Senator McCarran and . . . on McCarthy's exposure of certain individuals in the State Department. . . . The individual who was invited by the State Department . . . was the editor of the *New Republic.* . . . What action will you take? . . .

Humelsine: . . . if someone happens to come into the State Department to attend a meeting with a group and that individual gets up and sounds off . . . we cannot control that.

McCarthy: You mean unless you gave him special instructions to attack Senator McCarran . . . you would not take any action.

Humelsine: . . . I will investigate the matter most thoroughly. . . .

Humelsine: [two months later]. After practically turning the Department inside out to find some clue as to the source of Senator McCarthy's statement . . . and finding absolutely nothing . . . we turned to the clergyman who ran that seminar. They informed us that on Tuesday, March 11, in the Calvary Baptist Church on Eighth and H Streets two addresses were made. One was by the Reverend George M. Docherty . . . and the other was a talk called "An Analysis of Major Political Issues" by a Miss Helen Fuller . . . the Department knew nothing about this. . . .

McCarthy: . . . would it be possible that she attended the State Department seminar and took part in the discussion from the floor.

Humelsine: . . . that did not occur. There was no criticism whatsoever of either Senator McCarran or yourself voiced from the floor.

Even conversation is to be controlled.

McCarran: When did we get the supernumerary of "murderers' row" in your Department?

Humelsine: I have never heard that expression used in the Department of State.

McCarran: When four members of the Senate are called "murderers' row" that does not set very well.

Humelsine: . . . I would certainly like to investigate that and see if I can run it down.

McCarran: I have heard plenty of statements about your employing Alsop to try to undermine the Internal Security Committee . . . if we are "murderers' row," maybe we had better start earning our title.

McCarthy is powerful as a member of this committee. But the committee Chairman is far more powerful. Eisenhower urges the voters to give these enormous powers to Joseph McCarthy. Before he repeats his endorsement of McCarthy, he might ask himself what self-respecting man would willingly take responsibility for the State Department while it is held in McCarthy's vice-like grip.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Charles C. Sherrod Library
EAST TENNESSEE STATE COLLEGE
Johnson City, Tennessee

THE WEEK

RACETRACKS AS USUAL

Heavy pressures on the National Production Authority by building and construction men through the NPA's Construction Industry Advisory Committee has caused the agency to announce that on April 1, 1953, it plans to lift the two-year ban on the construction of bowling alleys, swimming pools, race tracks, theatres and other amusement and recreation buildings.

The ban was imposed because of the critical shortage of such materials as copper, steel and aluminum. The agency stated that builders can start ordering the critical materials now for use after April 1.

The announcement came on the heels of a speech by the NPA and Defense Production Authority head, Henry Fowler, informing the American Legion that we are behind in our rearmament program and warning against the growing complacency and apathy to defense needs throughout the country. Fowler said that while the production of critical materials is rising, completion of the program is still, at least, some three years away.

The NPA meeting at which the April 1 date was set was presided over by Rufus Newman Jr., director of the Controls Construction Division of the NPA. Newman, who has been associated with numerous government housing and construction agencies for some years, is not regarded as a man to oppose the wishes of the private construction industry. Newman has modelled himself generally after his predecessor, Frank Creedon, who was widely publicized for rebuilding the Tanforan Race Track at the end of World War II when critical materials were as scarce as they are at the present time.

STABILIZATION SHIFTS

With the resignation of conscientious Ellis Arnall as Price Stabilizer, federal control agencies are receiving a shake up. However, there is little hope that this will improve the lot of the consumer.

The former Governor of Georgia, as OPS chief, did his utmost to hold down prices, but there were too many people, too many forces, working against him. The New York *Times* charges that Arnall used his job to keep in the public eye by "issuing dire and quite unsupported prophecies of ruinous inflation in the offing." But, in fact, the Price Stabilizer's prophecies were fully supported by the Consumers' Price Index. A water-weak controls program just could not be effectively administered.

Rent Stabilizer Tighe Woods now succeeds Arnall as price chief. No achievements of note have been recorded by Woods in the rent field with the cost of rental dwellings rising steadily, with the help of rapidly debilitating controls laws, since he took office some four years ago, and official Washington is skeptical of his performing any better in the new post.

The Office of Price Stabilization is now placing in effect its new community pricing program of dollar-and-cents ceilings to replace percentage markup arrangements on prices of such food items as it still controls. This system will be a boon to the low overhead businessman and could possibly be a slight help even to the consumer. On automobiles, however, the OPS is substituting percentage markups for dollar-and-cent price ceilings, in line with the Herlong Amendment to the Defense Production Act to give all wholesalers and retailers their full pre-Korean margins.

A former Texas lawyer and general counsel of the Economic Stabilization Agency since 1950, James M. Henderson, has assumed the rent-stabilization duties. The rent laws become further emaciated on September 30, when all rents will automatically be decontrolled unless local governing bodies have requested extension of ceiling regulations. To date 450 communities with six million population have requested extension. Another 200 communities with 14 million persons, now under ceilings, have not made such requests.

THE LEGION AND THE ACLU

The American Legion embarrassed all its thoughtful and intelligent members when at its New York convention a few days ago it demanded that the government should investigate the "questionable record of subversive activities" of the American Civil Liberties Union. The Union has no such activities, and you have to be at a pretty low level of information not to know this.

As its officers promptly pointed out, the ACLU's nonpartisan record has been praised by General MacArthur and Governor Dewey, among a lot of other people. It does not appear on any list of subversive organizations ever issued by the Attorney General, or in the similar lists of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Its reputable standing is well known to many government agencies, including the FBI, with which the ACLU is constantly in touch. For many years, it has barred from its governing bodies and staffs all adherents of Communist or other totalitarian doctrines. Says the Union:

> The suggestion that the ACLU is a Communist or Communist-front organization is preposterous. It exists simply and solely to defend the civil liberties—free speech, fair trial and equality before the law—of everybody. It is thus diametrically opposed to the political tyranny of Communism. The only thing about Communists which it ever defends are their civil liberties, and the only reason it defends them for Communists is that those civil liberties belong not to them but to all Americans.

Before its New York convention, the American Legion promised that it had grown up and would stop scaring women on the street and throwing furniture out hotel windows. The assault on the ACLU unhappily suggests it still has a long way to go on the road to adulthood.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ITALY: NEW ANCHOR FOR DEFENSE?

THE ITALIAN army now comprises seven infantry divisions, one armored division and three Alpine brigades. By the end of the year these figures will almost certainly have increased to the quite respectable total of nine infantry divisions, two armored divisions and five Alpine brigades. All of them will be as well-armed, equipped and trained as any in Europe. There also will be about 800 tanks. Moreover, Defense Minister Pacciardi recently promised US Army Secretary Frank Pace that by early next year "Italy will be, next to Russia, the most-armed and the best-armed nation in continental Europe."

Mathematically, the statement is accurate. And if military power and possibilities depended only on bare quantitative statistics, it would also be true. But there is such an enormous gap between the Soviets' armed strength and the Italian that the juxtaposition becomes a deliberate falsification of the facts of power. Equally disingenuous is the omission of any mention of France. If Italy has more and better armed troops physically present, it will be because the French are still forced to pin down most of their men and material in Asia.

Pacciardi's statement is intended first of all to impress the gentlemen in Washington who hold the purse strings of MSA, and to win favor for Italy in US public opinion as a better investment than France. For there are strings attached to Italy's fulfillment of the 1953 program. They are: US direct aid must permit the Italian Government to carry out the recommendations of the Temporary Council Committee of NATO regarding allocations for the defense budget; US military equipment must arrive on time and in adequate quantities; a larger total of US off-shore orders must be placed with Italian industries.

Since fulfillment of these conditions—and they cannot be fulfilled without cutting to some extent into the satisfaction of similar French requests—would boost the stock of the De Gasperi government, the Defense Minister's statement has an even more obvious domestic political purpose. Pacciardi is the representative of the tiny Republican Party in an almost overwhelmingly Christian Democratic cabinet. His only chance to stay in the government is for De Gasperi to win in next year's national election; and the Pacciardi statement is intended to win two kinds of votes in that election.

The first kind are on the Right. "Next to Russia" means that Italy is more important than France. De Gasperi needs the support of Monarchists and Neo-Fascists. Among both, the Fascist heritage is strong enough to maintain the association between a large army and great national prestige. And though few sensible Italians really have nostalgic illusions about their country's becoming a first-rate power, many hope it may displace France in the top rank of second-rate ones.

The second kind of votes are on the Left, in the anti-Communist parties and even in Pietro Nenni's fellow-traveling Socialist Party. Unemployment is the plague of Italian economic life, and the ace-card of the Communist game. A soldier is an employed man; and industries working for rearmament make more jobs. Moreover, resentment against the US and resistance to US influence are weaker in Italy than in France. There is not the same fear of Germany; indeed there is plenty of preference for economic and political links with Germany rather than France.

Secretary Pace has joined such authentic military experts as Generals Eisenhower, Ridgway and Gruenther, and Admiral Carney in praising the training, discipline and spirit of the new Italian army. Presumably, all of them remembered the lessons of the past: before each of the two first world wars the crack units of the *alpini* and *bersaglieri* showed great brilliance and enthusiasm on the parade ground; and in each of the two wars, the Italian army as a whole did not do famously. If the American officers who praised the Italian soldiers had in mind, as Pacciardi did, the psychological need to help build up national pride and self-confidence, it is to be noted that a similar need exists in France and the officers were less enthusiastic in their words of praise of the French.

One explanation in military circles here in Rome is that the Americans largely responsible for Atlantic military strategy are forced *cout qui cout* to have a "will to believe" in Italian military possibilities. A gradual shift from the French military concept of defense of the "fortress Europe" to a broader Atlantic concept is making the Americans less interested in the French contribution and more in the Italian.

The key to the new strategy is airpower and seapower, with ground power concentrated on the northwestern and southeastern flanks rather than in the middle of continental Europe. Instead of trying to block an invading Russian army east of the Rhine, hence keeping it out of France, the new strategic plan is to deny the Russians access to the North Atlantic and East Mediterranean for their submarines, and to protect the US air bases in England, the Balkans and North Africa.

In the northwest, this means strengthening not so much the French ground forces as the Germans, Danes, Dutch and Belgians, helping the Americans and British transform the area of northwest Germany, the Low Countries and the Channel strip of France into a land shield, protecting Britain as the base of anti-submarine warfare in the North Atlantic and, even more, as the base of US aviation. In the southeast, it means strengthening the Italians as the Western link of a chain extending from North Italy and Austria through Yugoslavia, Greece and Turkey to the Middle East.

As Germany is to be the anchor in the north, so will Italy be in the south. And as (in the Italian view) the Germans are the first favorites of the Americans, the Italians are more than content to have a chance to displace the French as the second favorites.

Rome PERCY WINNER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II. WHO IS RICHARD NIXON?

WHY HAS the Republican Party suffered 20 years of defeat? Richard Nixon, Republican candidate for Vice-President, gave the answer to the Los Angeles County Republican Assembly on June 20, 1949:

The Republican Party has gotten itself in the position of being classed as the tool of big business and vested interests. This charge is false, and we should make a resounding declaration of independence from Wall Street, from labor bosses and any other vested interests.

Nixon, the public orator, has made many resounding declarations of independence, heightened in their impact upon his listeners because whatever he says seems completely sincere. However Nixon's public personality and his private personality shake hands as strangers when they meet.

On August 2, 1952, when he returned to California the Vice-Presidential candidate, Nixon, was welcomed at the home of Kyle Palmer, political editor of the tory Los Angeles *Times*. The men who greeted him were Al Gock, chairman of the board of the Bank of America; Leonard Firestone of the tire and rubber company; Joseph Schenck, Daryl Zanuck, Harry Cohn, Louis B. Mayer, Edward Mannix, Mervyn LeRoy and Harry Brand, all movie magnates; Justin Dart, president of a drugstore chain; William Mullendore, a utility executive; Norman Chandler, publisher of the *Times*, and many other insurance executives and representatives of "big business and the vested interests."

Richard M. Nixon

Nixon, the independent, remains their tool. That much is made perfectly obvious by Nixon's voting record since 1946 when the "big business and the vested interests" of Whittier County sent him to Washington, the victor over a New Deal liberal.

In the House, Nixon voted:

To cut revenues by cutting income taxes.

To enact the Taft-Hartley Law.

To exempt the railroads from the anti-trust laws.

To prevent the extension of coverage for social security.

To cut the Mutual Defense Program by $55 million.

To exempt gas producers from federal regulation.

To prevent abolition of the poll tax.

To end federal rent control within 80 days (1950).

To kill federal slum clearance, low-rental and co-operative housing.

To deny $60 million in aid to Korea (1950).

In his two years in the Senate, Nixon voted.

For cutting public housing from 50,000 to 5,000 units.

For prohibiting restrictions against black markets.

Against higher taxes on excess profits.

For cutting $100 million from soil-conservation funds.

For ending all price and wage controls (1952).

For state ownership of tidelands oil.

For the McCarran Act.

Against the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Of particular service was Nixon's effort when he joined with Sen. William Knowland (R, Calif.) to persuade the Senate to permit the city of Los Angeles to welsh on its contract with the government for slum clearance and construction of 10,000 housing units. The contract had been signed by the city. Then CASH (The Committee Against Socialist Housing) went to work. The Council reversed itself but lost out when the California Supreme Court ordered compliance. The real-estate lobby, led by Nixon and Knowland, persuaded the Senate to vote by 44 to 32 to turn down the project.

Nixon has been a tool of "big business and the vested interests." Yet, as he pointed out, to be recognized as such is to be condemned to certain defeat. How could this contradiction be overcome—particularly in a state as unstable in its extremes of wealth and poverty, of pretensions and unsolved problems, as California?

That question was faced throughout the nation by the present generation of political managers for American industry. They started with the Chamber of Commerce's Committee on Communism that directed the strategy for the Dies Committee. They worked with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tremendous concentration, picking off militant liberals in key areas through the use of huge funds and smear campaigns. They perfected the strategy in Florida and California and applied it with variations in Maryland, Wisconsin, Utah and North Carolina.

Their strategy was to center on the single issue of Communism and to drive home half-truths and untruths concerning the Communist threat so relentlessly that all other issues were obscured in the mind of voters overcome by unreasoning fear. Their strategy called wherever possible for a young spell-binder, wholly pliable, basically unprincipled, heavily subsidized, and physically cast in the recognizable mold of Hollywood and television heroes, with well-cut clothes, and a photogenic exterior through which the presence of "big business and the vested interests" would not shine.

Sen. George Smathers (D, Fla.) belonged to this new type of synthetic candidate. There are many others. Richard Milhous Nixon is the most convincing and successful product of them all.

Thus it was three years after he entered the House of Representatives that Richard Nixon first asked for a special order to address the House. It was granted, and he reviewed his main contribution to public service in Washington—the conviction of Alger Hiss.

Nixon traced the story back to its beginnings, in July, 1948, when the testimony of a one-time Communist spy, Elizabeth Bentley, brought forth another witness who had repented, and yet kept to himself his awful knowledge during 10 years. Nixon justifiably claimed credit for keeping the Un-American Activities Committee after Chambers when other committee members wearied of his charges. He charged the Administration with "inexcusable inaction" in failing to uproot Communists in government but laid this to "politics-as-usual" rather than sympathy for Communism on the Administration's part. He concluded with two practicable recommendations: The extension of the statute of limitations on espionage cases from three to 10 years, and the tightening of the standards used in loyalty checks. He proposed no further legislation and recommended the substitution of a "security program" for a "loyalty program" in order that "doubt can be resolved in favor of the government without the necessity of proving disloyalty and thereby reflecting on the character of a possibly loyal but indiscreet government employee."

All this sounded fair enough. On closer scrutiny Alan Barth wrote in *The Loyalty of Free Men:*

> The appealing simplicity of this arrangement is illusory. When it was first used in the State Department in 1947 it was applied in an extremely arbitrary manner to 10 employees; the Department simply told them they were dismissed as security risks without giving them any indication of the charges against them or any chance to refute those charges. . . .

In the same double-level manner that he perfected, Nixon, together with Karl Mundt, wrote the measure known today as the McCarran Act. Its presentation was moderate and persuasive. And buried in its provisions were the deadliest attacks on individual liberty advanced through legislation in our generation.

The intent of Mundt and Nixon could hardly have been to expose and weaken the ragged remnants of the US Communist Party. That job had been done, principally by Walter Reuther, Philip Murray and other leaders of the trade-union movement, by the time the Mundt-Nixon bill was written.

The purpose of Mundt and Nixon was to give an appearance of direction and achievement to political anti-Communism. Their problem was how to circumvent the Constitution's clear prohibition of all measures abridging the rights of free speech.

Those constitutional provisions were written at a time when this nation, six years of age, was surrounded by a hostile British Empire to the north, a hostile Spanish Empire to the south and west, a threatening France, and unsubdued Indian tribes. Yet even in that perilous situation, treason was narrowly defined and abridgment of free speech forbidden in the most uncompromising terms.

However, the courts had recognized that repressive action could be taken in the face of "clear and present danger." So Mundt and Nixon wrote a court opinion in their bill declaring that the Communist Party (whose vote had fallen from 103,000 in 1932 to 49,000 in 1940) was in fact "a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions."

If this were so, legislation had already been enacted and sanctioned by the courts to deal with the threat. The criminal statutes contained sections dealing with "rebellion or insurrection" . . . "conspiracy to overthrow . . . or destroy" the government by force, and even broad provisions making it a criminal offense to advocate or teach the desirability or propriety of overthrowing the government "by force or violence." The Criminal Code contained further elaborate provisions requiring the registration of "every organization subject to foreign control." Naturally it contained, since 1890, laws defining and punishing treason including espionage which were drastically strengthened after World War II.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

However, Mundt and Nixon were not satisfied. They provided in their bill for punishment including 10-year jail sentences, fines of $10,000 and loss of citizenship for efforts to establish a dictatorship under foreign control. They provided further for:

The designation by the Attorney General of Communist fronts.

The labeling of Communist and Communist-front literature.

The denial of passports and non-elective federal jobs to Communists.

The Mundt-Nixon bill, departing radically from the Constitution, began by regulating opinion, not conduct.

It threatened the existence of many groups by seeking to repress "Communist political organizations" defined as having "some but not necessarily all of the ordinary and usual characteristics of a political party" directed by a foreign Communist government. In still more vague terms, it sought to create a Subversive Activities Control Board and to direct it to determine a Communist-front according to many considerations such as the extent to which a given organization deviated from the Communist Party line. Thus these organizations were to be condemned not for their illegal acts but solely on the basis of their opinions and ideas. Any trade union or progressive group whose views coincided even in part with those of the Communist Party could well be charged with violating the Mundt-Nixon Law and could thus be destroyed.

For these reasons the CIO concluded in its testimony before a House Committee: "The Nixon bill is in fundamental conflict with our constitutional form of government and with the pressures of a democratic society."

The Mundt-Nixon bill made it illegal for any individual or organization "knowingly" to conspire with any other person "to perform any act which would substantially facilitate" the establishment here of a "totalitarian dictatorship" under foreign domination. Despite the extreme penalities including loss of citizenship for this and other "illegal acts" the trial procedures established by the bill were arbitrary and peremptory. The Attorney General was directed, without any hearing or criminal proceeding, to impose the brand of "Communist" upon a list of organizations and fronts. To aid his determinations he was authorized to subpoena the boards and records of any organization he chose to suspect. The non-elected Subversive Activities Control Board was authorized to make an administrative finding on which drastic punishment might result. No judge and no jury was involved in the Board's hearings; the only right of appeal was to one court, the overburdened District of Columbia Court of Appeals. Its review could consider only questions of law.

The CIO in its testimony declared:

"The legislative findings upon which the statute rests, the trial procedure and the review procedure make mockery of our constitutional guarantees."

These views were shared by the great newspapers of America. The *Christian Science Monitor* wrote of the Mundt-Nixon bill:

> . . . It could easily set up the precedents and the machinery for a kind of political proscription which could be turned by any party in power against any minority it found troublesome.

The Denver *Post* wrote:

> . . . the worst thing about [this] bill is that it would not work against the Communists, but would work against many innocent persons.

The St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* wrote:

> . . . it is not far-fetched to say that this bill, if it became a law, could be used to harass and even to prosecute any nonconforming individual or group. . . . Imagine Joseph R. McCarthy in the White House and conducting a national purge of so-called "fellow-travelers." How many citizens could count themselves safe from defamation or even destruction?

The Senate version of Nixon's bill became the Mundt-Ferguson bill and later the McCarran bill, when McCarran added enough provisions to give it his own name. The New York *Times* called this bill fundamentally anti-democratic. It added:

> It could be used to impose restraints on freedom such as the American people have not known in 150 years.

That bill is now law. Its impact is already severe in restricting immigration and intimidating residents and citizens. Under a President less committed than Harry Truman to civil liberty, it may become the means of cutting down the spirit of freedom which has been inseparable from this nation's birth, growth and greatness.

It is on this issue, rather than his stand on secondary matters, that Nixon should properly be judged. Few people will belittle Nixon's role in the Hiss case. Few will regard it as a qualification for the Presidency. Nixon's willingness to serve as a tool of the great corporations is a heavy indictment of a candidate for national office. But above all, before our senses are dulled by fear and habit, we must ask: Is the co-author of the McCarran Act the man we want to place over our lives and within one heart beat of the most important temporal job in the world?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GOODBYE TO SPRINGFIELD

by William V. Shannon

WITH LABOR DAY past, the weeks of political peace are over. The secluded vacations of the candidates, the solemn strategy conferences, the ritualistic exchange of visits between the victors and their defeated rivals have come to an end. In the weeks ahead the candidates, their staffs and the newspapermen who pursue them will sigh, remembering the idyllic interlude in which they had time to eat three meals a day and get their shirts laundered.

Springfield, Ill., during that interlude, slowly assumed an air of victory. From Adlai Stevenson to the man who ran the mimeograph machine, there was an undertone of confidence. The staff, rushing from the executive mansion to the headquarters a block away, have felt the Democrats have the candidate and the issues. Barring some unforeseen disaster, they have concluded that victory is almost certain. The most familiar refrain has been, "Remember what happened to Dewey!"

Stevenson is both candidate and campaign manager. Wilson Wyatt is his right-hand man. The two work closely together. There are no other major advisers or political managers here. The only other people here are about a dozen young staff men. Some are experts on policy such as Arthur Schlesinger Jr. and others are political handymen such as James Lanigan, former legislative assistant to Averell Harriman. They have suffered, as all new groups must, from wasted effort and confusion. They have worked hard and well.

Stevenson speaks sincerely and often about the dangers of federal centralization. But the fact is he runs a very centralized operation himself. He sees every political visitor, makes all the major decisions and many of the minor ones, edits the press releases and writes the final draft of his own speeches. He is absolutely his own man. He likes to hear what his assistants think on anything and everything, but he makes up his own mind.

And he makes it up quickly. Whatever anguished reflection he may go through in periods of introspection, he moves rapidly in times of decision. The campaign organization so far seems to have a regular and steady beat because it is moving with the natural tempo of one man.

Sometimes this has drawbacks, as when Stevenson wrote his letter to the Oregon editor referring to "the mess in Washington." He wrote the long note personally which in itself is uncommon. He then forgot to mark it "not for publication." But the resulting flare-up has done him no lasting harm. In the long run, a candidate who makes no distinction between his political personality and his private personality will gain stature and respect.

Stevenson at all times has remained deft, good-humored, completely at ease. In contrast, Stevenson's nomination seems from here to have left Eisenhower and his many advisers discomfited and confused. Last spring in Paris, it must have seemed to Eisenhower and his trans-Atlantic visitors that the Democratic Party was the least of their problems. Now the situation is reversed. The party which seemed dispirited and divided has come together behind Stevenson. In contrast, the dreary parade of mossbacks in and out of Denver with the inevitable pictures and press conferences has focused a lot of unwelcome publicity on the true nature of Eisenhower's Party. Eisenhower's backers expected to offset the weakness of the party by the strength of the candidate—the strongest candidate, they believed. Now Stevenson appears a stronger campaigner, demonstrating his mastery as he meets each new situation, while Eisenhower exhibits his frustration by throwing away his carefully prepared speeches and tying himself in knots.

Eisenhower may be a Kansas Republican. But on every issue his personality conflicts with the pressures the Republican Party imposes on him. The Republicans are still a minority coalition, too narrow in their base and appeal to win. Unless they can convince independents and some Democrats that catastrophe is the price of continued Democratic administration, the Democratic coalition is certain to hold together. So the whole weight of the Republicans is thrown behind reckless charges of bankruptcy, Communism in government and impending disaster at home and abroad. Taft embodied this irresponsible approach. Every other Republican including Nixon is anxious to employ it, now that Taft is defeated. Yet Eisenhower, who alone among the Republican leaders has held responsibility in the last 10 years, just can't bring himself to heap the Korean War onto Truman and claim that war and collapse will follow hard on the election of his opponent. Nor will he wear the Messiah's cloak that John Foster Dulles attempted to throw over his shoulders. He is too honest a man.

Stevenson's relaxed manner is a reflection that he is subject to almost none of these pressures and contradictions. His concentration on state issues has been intense. He asserts his small abilities contrasted with the magni-

William V. Shannon, a correspondent for the New York Post, is currently reporting on the Stevenson campaign.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tude of the problems any President will face. He can state these admissions; they are not damaging charges in Republican hands. For Stevenson has in fact had extensive experience in making and executing military and foreign policies. For three years during the war he was Frank Knox's assistant in the Navy Department. He made an important economic mission to Italy in 1943 and to other countries the following year. He attended San Francisco and several of the other major postwar conferences. While Stettinius and then Austin held title to the job of American delegate, Stevenson was in fact the senior American diplomat at the UN during its first two years. He has negotiated with Gromyko and knows many of the allied and UN leaders.

The late Senator Vandenberg wrote Stevenson in 1947:

I am glad you are going to the General Assembly. I want you to know—as a matter of record—that when I was asked for recommendations in connection with the United States Delegation, I put your name down as a "must." I wish you were devoting all of your time to our foreign affairs at a high level in the State Department.

On one issue—of an unworthy party minority—Stevenson and Eisenhower have faced a common problem. The results offer an enlightening contrast. The Democrats were bedeviled by a Dixiecrat minority committed to protect a class and racial society in the South. They were acknowledged and greatly weakened. The issue was not forced, but the contest was not compromised. The majority made it clear that it would let the Dixiecrats go and gamble on defeat rather than yield on its program. The Dixiecrats stayed—kept on the terms set by the majority.

The Republicans faced a similar group of extremists in the minority now referred to as "the American Party" by Colonel McCormick. It works within the Republican Party. It seeks to subvert the party's historic aims of upholding individual liberty. It looks on Eisenhower's moderation and tolerance as foolish and refers to his closest associates as traitors. This group, one hopes, is still a minority in the Republican Party. Yet its views were enshrined in the platform. It is not tolerated on the majority's terms. It is backed on its own terms, as the wretched statements of Eisenhower and Nixon make clear. Stevenson's managers have enough faith in the voters to believe that when Eisenhower caved in on McCarthy he traded the little visibles for the great imponderables and so lost, for mean advantage, the impregnability of a moral and principled stand.

THE UNDUE PROCESS OF PASSPORTS

by Eugene Gressman

THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S efforts to erect a bureaucratic wall of conformity about the shores of the United States are encountering serious difficulties, at least in so far as American citizens are concerned. During the last few years the Department has tried to confine freedom of movement across the borders to the narrow path of intellectual orthodoxy. It is a path open only to those who ostensibly conform to so-called loyal, safe or anti-Communist ideologies. Straying from that path, either in fact or in fantasy, too often has meant the summary confinement of the American citizen to his country and the arbitrary denial to the foreign citizen of the privilege of entering this frightened arsenal of democracy.

But an increasingly indignant public reaction and an enlightened judiciary are beginning to counter-balance the State Department's high-handed policy. Under the impact of those two forces, the Department is slowly realizing that it cannot continue to ridicule and ignore the constitutional right of American citizens to leave the United States, whatever may be their political or economic views. It is beginning to appreciate that elemental concepts of due process are applicable to all judicial and quasi-judicial functions of the government, not excluding the granting and denying of passports.

The right to travel abroad, of course, is dependent these days upon the possession of a passport. Without it an American citizen is free to travel to only a mere handful of foreign countries. Even were the United States to lift its own passport requirements, the citizen would find that most other nations now demand such a document as a condition to entry therein. A passport is thus both a legal and practical necessity for most would-be travelers.

Legally, the passport requirement is said to rest upon two bases, both of which permit a wide range of official discretion. One is the discretionary power inherent in the exercise of the Presidential authority to conduct foreign relations, a passport being thought to be a purely political document addressed to foreign powers and its issuance a political matter. But this position has commended itself only to the more partisan of the State Department's apologists. Its fatal weakness is its failure to recognize that a passport involves the interests of the individual applicant far more than foreign affairs and that even the political control over foreign relations must

Eugene Gressman is a practicing attorney in Washington, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be conducted in subordination to the applicable provisions of the Constitution.

Far sounder is the drawing of discretionary passport power from legislative wells. Congress has specifically lodged the authority to issue passports in the Secretary of State, who acts through the Department's Passport Division. This authority is expressed by the broad statutory language that the Secretary "may" issue passports to United States citizens under Presidential rules and regulations. The executive order now in effect permits him to deny passports, invalidate them or restrict their use "in his discretion," a phrase heretofore viewed in official quarters as unlimited in scope.

Thus the American citizen's right to travel abroad has been treated as subject to the limitless discretion of the Secretary of State or, more precisely, to the limitless discretion of Mrs. Ruth Shipley, Chief of the Passport Division. In many respects this discretion has been wisely exercised. Attempts to avoid legal sanctions, lack of citizenship and inability of the United States to protect the applicant in the area where he intends to travel are among the valid reasons used for denying passports. But in recent years passports have been denied, invalidated or restricted for no reason other than the applicant's beliefs, associations or affiliations. And this has frequently occurred in a manner that may be charitably described as unbecoming the American traditions of fairness and due process. In an increasing number of instances the applicant has summarily been informed, without explanation or chance for a hearing, that "travel abroad at this time would be contrary to the best interests of the United States." And this judgment has been final, there being no mechanism provided for appeal to higher authorities.

It is on the procedural steps that the Department has stubbed its toe. Even an untutored sense of justice revolts at a secret procedure whereby passports are denied, in the Department's own words, "only on the basis of very clear and definite reports from the investigative and security offices of this Department and of other government departments and agencies and from foreign governments containing well-authenticated information concerning past and present activities and associations of the applicant." And it is small comfort to know that this *ex parte* judgment is rendered only "after consultation by responsible officers of the Passport Division with security officers, and political and administrative officers of the Department." In short, several officials gather secretly behind closed doors, peruse secret intelligence reports and purport to arrive at a fair judgment affecting not only the citizen's right to travel but also his reputation and possibly his livelihood and financial well-being. But it is precisely that type of judgment that the framers of the Bill of Rights meant to include within the guarantees of due process, a fact which the Department has completely overlooked up to now.

The long-smoldering protest against such tyrannical abuse of discretion burst into bright flames last June on the floor of the Senate. Using the example of the arbitrary denial of a passport to Professor Linus Pauling, Sen. Wayne Morse bitterly denounced the totalitarian technique employed by the passport authorities, the technique of operating on "the principle of hush-hush and secrecy." He decried the lack of opportunity to contest or even to know the adverse information concerning the applicant and the complete absence of any appeal procedure. He called for the removal of Secretary Acheson because of his responsibility for maintaining this star-chamber system. Morse thereupon introduced a bill permitting anyone who had been denied a passport to appeal the decision to the Subversive Activities Control Board, which would then hold a public hearing and determine from the evidence submitted at that hearing whether the applicant was entitled to a passport.

Hard on the heels of this powerful voice of public indignation came a penetrating decision from a special three-judge federal court in the District of Columbia, holding that the revocation of a passport without notice and hearing, as well as a refusal to renew such passport without an opportunity to be heard, was without authority of law. Speaking through Judge Richmond Keech, the court felt that the basic passport statute, providing simply that the Secretary of State "may" grant passports, was constitutional only if it were interpreted so as to require a notice and a hearing before revoking or refusing to renew a passport; and the same reasoning would apply to a denial of a passport. In so doing, the court gave express recognition to the citizen's Constitutional freedom to travel outside the United States, describing it as an attribute of personal liberty. That liberty was said to be especially important today "when modern transportation has made all the world easily accessible and when the executive and legislative departments of our government have encouraged a welding together of nations and free intercourse of our citizens with those of other friendly countries." And it was further noted that "personal liberty to go abroad is particularly important to an individual whose livelihood is dependent upon the right to travel."

Soon after Morse's attack got under way, Acheson announced that the Department was "at work now on improving" its passport procedures, though he opined

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that "there has been no arbitrary action of any sort." In McCarthy-like overtones, which sounded strange from Acheson's lips, he said he would pay no attention to Communist-inspired attacks but would consider only such "honest criticism" as came from persons not affiliated with Communist-front groups. Apparently he considered neither Senator Morse nor Judge Keech and his colleagues to be affiliates of Communist-front groups. The combined weight of their views could not easily be ignored. And an additional element entered the picture in the form of the embarrassing Lattimore incident, puncturing once and for all the fiction of the infallibility of the so-called "well-authenticated information" secretly collected by government agencies. This one incident was enough to demonstrate the danger of relying upon unrevealed sources of information and not giving the individual a chance to refute or explain the matter.

These various factors had their inevitable effect. The Department has now proposed a plan, awaiting only the approval of Secretary Acheson, which would alleviate some of the unfairness. Under this plan, an applicant who has been notified by the Passport Division of an initial or tentative refusal would be allowed an informal discussion with officials of the Division, who would be obliged to tell him the grounds of the refusal and to give him a chance to bring in evidence. If the passport still is refused, the applicant could then appeal to a Passport Appeals Board, consisting of three senior officers of the State Department. Counsel would be allowed at this hearing and the applicant would be given all the information and evidence on which denial was based "in so far as security considerations permit." No passport would be issued and no appeal would be heard for any applicant who admitted membership in the Communist Party. And in the process of determining whether an applicant was a Communist, officials would give weight to his membership and participation in so-called Communist-front organizations, his current activities, the degree of his "surrender" to Communist discipline, his reputation in his community, etc. Determination would also be made whether the applicant is likely to engage in activities abroad which, if done in this country, would violate laws designed to protect national security.

That the applicant will be given the right to know at least some of the reasons why a passport is being denied him and that he can argue and appeal the matter within the Department will constitute a significant advance over present procedures, wherein such factors are recognized only sporadically and as a matter of discretion. But there is still left a substantial residue of unbridled discretion to treat the applicant and his freedom to travel as the officials see fit. And the program represents some of the worst features of the truncated due process marking a fundamental fear of procedural and substantive freedom.

What this proposed plan does, in effect, is to infiltrate the passport procedure with all the inanities and unfairness of the federal employee loyalty program. That program gives a semblance of a hearing without the real substance of due process. Malicious gossip and hearsay are allowed to masquerade under the cloak of security restrictions. Communism and disloyalty often become equated with liberalism and non-conformity. Judgments are rendered without revealing the reasons therefore, and suspicion does the work of proof. Such procedures have been constitutionally validated as to government employees by an evenly divided Supreme Court. But whether passport applicants can be constitutionally subjected to this insulting program is an open and serious question.

The passport program needs a far greater overhaul than the Department has proposed. It needs an overhaul of the type suggested by Senator Morse and decreed by the District of Columbia court. Due process must be applied to its fullest extent. Applicants should know all the information collected by the government; they should have the fullest chance to refute or explain that information; and they should have an opportunity to appeal to an independent authority. But even if all of these procedural reforms should be brought about, serious problems would still remain. Still unanswered would be the constitutionality of denying passports to applicants—even after a fair hearing—on the basis of their left-wing political views, activities and associations, the likelihood that they will criticize the United States while abroad, the likelihood that their travel abroad will aid the "international Communist conspiracy," or the likelihood that they will commit a crime while abroad.

Those are problems which no responsible official has tried to meet. Not even Senator Morse has touched upon them. They are a component part of the great anti-Communist psychosis which has swept this country, a psychosis which has left permanent wounds in the cause of freedom. Cleansing the air of the Passport Division with the fresh breeze of procedural due process is a commendable thing. But the foul odor of denials of substantive constitutional rights still remains. A full and fair hearing means little if one is still denied a passport because of one's political or economic orientation. That is a challenge that is still to be met.

[Part II of this article will appear next week.]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STALIN REPAINTS THE FACADE

by Samuel L. Sharp

FIFTEEN HUNDRED delegates, representing the seven million members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, will gather early next month in Moscow, to hear a report presented in the name of the Central Committee, to approve the directives of the party for the new and ambitious Five Year Plan, and to vote a change in the rules of the party. The bland announcement, calling the 19th Congress of the CPSU, contained not a word of apology or explanation for the delay in convening it after 13 years instead of the three years prescribed by the present rules. The decision of the Kremlin hierarchy seems to open a new chapter in the history of the Bolshevik party, and it is not unreasonable to see in the forthcoming Congress the beginning of the post-Stalin phase of the Soviet state, a phase which even the proverbial longevity of Georgians could not indefinitely delay. The transition is symbolized by the fact that for the first time in many years the report of the Central Committee will be given not by Stalin but by Malenkov. This may be a clue to the choice of a successor to the all-important job of the Secretary-General though this is still no more than a good guess.

More significant than the possible shift of personalities is the redefinition of the party's current aims and the reform of its top policy-making bodies, which includes the abolition of the notorious Politburo. The duties of the members are also being redefined in terms that stress devotion to the daily tasks of party and state rather than mastery of the theoretical subtleties of Marxism. The party is thus to become more than ever a potent auxiliary of the Soviet state, geared to the task of demanding yet more exertion from the citizens of the vast empire in the name of still vague goals of future bliss.

The CPSU long ago lost the character of an elite party with a limited membership originally planned by Lenin. Its expansion started in Lenin's lifetime; under Stalin, if its subsidiary organizations are counted, the party spread to embrace about one-sixth of the population of the USSR. Yet by comparison with the situation in other countries at present under Soviet control, the CPSU as such had a narrower popular base than the Communist and "Workers' " parties of Eastern Europe. No less than 13 percent of the population of Czechoslovakia, 10 percent of that of Hungary, more than 6 percent in Bulgaria and some 4.5 percent in Poland and Rumania are enrolled in their respective Communist parties. The percentage in the Soviet Union is at present about 3.5. It seems that the base of the party is to be enlarged, and the new rules indicate a change in this direction. No longer defined as servants of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the members of the party are supposed to symbolize the broad social harmony and solidarity of "non-antagonistic" classes allegedly prevailing in the Soviet Union. The appearance of an expressly stated requirement of Soviet citizenship for members serves to stress the more intimate connection between the party and the state, as does the reformulation and dramatization of the duties of individual members as well as of the tasks of the party itself. The CPSU is called upon to perform its current tasks on a broader façade behind which the hard core of what a German expert on Communism recently called an "*Interessenpartei der Funkzionaerklasse*" (party of the officials' interests) can entrench itself more comfortably than it could in the days of idealistic, soul-searching and embarrassingly logical Old Bolsheviks. It is no accident that the modest *b* which stood for "Bolsheviks" is to disappear from the name of the party. It has become an empty symbol for the party, five of whose seven million members have joined in the last 10 years.

The "new Presidium." The passage of the draft statutes which has received the most attention is significant for what it omits rather than for what it contains. The ill-famed Politburo as well as the less famous but important Orgburo are not mentioned in the listing of the party's new structure. The work of the Central Committee is to be conducted between plenary sessions by a Presidium of as yet undefined composition. All the "current" work is to be concentrated in the Secretariat. The Presidium, judging by a report in *Pravda,* may simply be another name for the Politburo. It is not really a "new" institution. Beatrice and Sidney Webb, in their book on Soviet Communism, mentioned "a Presidium of four members and four alternates" as being in charge between plenary session of the Central Committee.

But what is the significance of the disappearance of the Politburo? That body had come to be looked upon as the real seat of power in the CPSU. Actually, since 1927, it held this position of importance only by the tolerance accorded it by the Secretary-General, J. V. Stalin. It is true that Stalin had once described the Po-

Samuel L. Sharp teaches international relations at the American University. He is the author of New Constitutions in the Soviet Sphere *and of many articles on government and politics in the Soviet area.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

litburo as the "sovereign" among the various organs of the Central Committee, but the record shows that the Politburo soon came under the control of the Secretariat, a control that became absolute as the years went by. The Secretariat very early became known as "a little Politburo," expecially after it was transformed from a purely technical organ into the body that gave Stalin control over the daily life of the party. It was not long before the members of the "big Politburo" began to feel the uncomfortable encroachments of the "little Politburo," as witnessed by the attack launched against the Secretariat by Zinoviev and others at the XII and XIV Party Congress. But by then it was too late.

It is true that the Politburo has appeared to be the more glamorous institution of the two; its synthetic name, the lack of public records of its meetings—these were the main factors contributing to the establishment of its sinister reputation as the directing body of party and government in the Soviet Union. Yet this impression should be corrected by focusing attention on the fact that, at least since 1927, the Politburo has functioned as the creature of the Secretary-General and was packed with reliable associates of the dictator.

The change in the rules seems to indicate an attempt to secure the position of the future Secretary-General by the physical elimination of party organs that could conceivably develop into crystallizing centers of rivalry with, or opposition to, the Secretary-General. It is not surprising to see this move accompanied by a revival of the institution of the Presidium. The term, used in the governmental set-up of the Soviet Union, conveys the impression of collegial functioning, a comfortable façade for actual one-man management.

While the revised statute seems to be an attempt to secure the position of the Secretariat against possible rivals at the top, the changes indicate also an attempt to make the position of the Central Committee itself more secure within the party as a whole. The Party Conference which was supposed to be called at least once a year between Congresses has disappeared in the new rules. The significance of this deletion becomes obvious when one realizes that the Party Conference was entitled, in accordance with the rules of 1939 "to replace a part of the members of the Central Committee" by removing individual members who had failed to fulfill their duties. This strengthens the position of Central Committee members against pressure from below. In addition a lengthy new article stresses expressly that members of the Central Committee cannot be excluded from the party by action taken by grass-root cells of the party. Expulsion proceedings against a member of the Central Committee can now be initiated only by the Party Congress or, in the interval between Congresses, by a two-thirds majority of the Central Committee.

Another significant change in the rules is a dramatization of the duties of members of the party. These duties are enumerated under 11 headings as against four in the current rules. Nor is the new sequence of the duties as compared with the current statute without meaning. The *first* duty of a member under the old rules was to "work untiringly to improve his political knowledge and to master the principles of Marxism-Leninism." A similar duty is now tucked away as the *fifth* of the party's 11 commandments in a softer version, reserving the duty to work "untiringly" for more practical purposes. This may be in preparation for a democratization of the rules of admission, indicated also in other parts of the new rules. Thus a candidate for membership who, after a year's apprenticeship, has not met the qualifications for admission to full status, may be given another chance by prolongation of his candidacy for one year. There was no such leniency in the currently operating statute.

Bigger and more representative at the bottom, smaller and more centralized at the top, the party is due to emerge from next month's Congress as a yet more powerful, stream-lined juggernaut. The elimination of the Org-and Politburos strengthens the position of the new Secretary-General. Yet Malenkov, if he be the heir, will have to work out a positive relationship with the many seconds-in-command, a number of whom will have been his rivals for the top post. It is to secure their positions against spontaneous criticism that membership on the Central Committee is made more emphatically sacrosanct. At the same time the lower echelons, who will be only remotely involved in the power struggle, will be more disciplined and subject to control of the hierarchy.

Whether these printed safeguards will prevent bad trouble for the party on Stalin's death remains to be seen. For the outside world there is no visible comfort nor need for more than what has become routine anxiety over the new Soviet move. To the Soviet citizen the reaffirmation of the party's resolution to hold on to power and to meet the alleged hostility of the non-Communist world by a stepped-up production effort means only more of the same. The stress on "transition to Communism" as one of the main current tasks of the party simply means that the distant goal with its pleasant implication of abundance is once more dangled before the eyes of the weary people in an attempt to create the impression that their current deprivations make sense and are leading somewhere. At the same time no doubt is left that the road to Communism leads through more sweat and toil and, if necessary, blood.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LITERATURE AND THE ARTS

ARMOR AND HITLER

by Thomas R. Phillips

GENERAL GUDERIAN, the last Chief of Staff of the German Army under Hitler, and the organizer of German forces, has written the most interesting account, and one of the most informative, of the war to come from the German side. He limits his book to matters with which he was personally concerned. It carries along three stories: Guderian's fight for the development of German armored forces; a detailed account of the campaigns in which he participated; and, his relations with Hitler, who twice dismissed him.

PANZER LEADER, by Gen. Heinz Guderian, translated by Constantine Fitzgibbon (Dutton; $7.50).

Guderian's interest in tanks commenced when he was assigned to the Motor Transport service early in 1921. He then developed his ideas of the value of rapid movement. He admits the inspiration received from the writings of the British Capt. Liddell Hart and Generals Fuller and Martel.

By 1929 he was instructing in tank operations and German troops were using dummy tanks in maneuvers. Progress was by no means easy. As in the United States and Great Britain, the cavalry fought against tanks and succeeded in delaying their adoption in Germany.

Another obstacle to be overcome was in regard to employment. Should tanks be dispersed and operate with infantry formations, or should they be organized into large armored units, combined with motorized infantry, and capable of independent operations?

The French adopted the former principle and the Germans, under the unceasing pressure of Guderian, the latter. The stupendous victories in Poland, France and the first year of the war in Russia were largely due to the employment of Panzer army corps and Panzer armies. After Hitler took command of the German armies, armored units were used piecemeal and never accomplished the results of which they were capable in mass. Another factor in their lessened usefulness was the Soviet T-34 tank, which proved in every way superior to the German, better gunned and better armored, and available in larger numbers than German armor.

Guderian participated as a panzer general in the Polish campaign, the campaign in France and the Low Countries, the 1941 campaign in Russia, and as Chief of the Army General Staff in charge of the Russian front from July, 1944, until he was dismissed by Hitler in March, 1945.

He relates the first authentic story about how the strategy of a breakthrough in the center of the Allied armies in the West was decided upon, instead of a revised Schlieffen wheel with the principal effort on the North flank. An officer-courier, flying at night with important papers containing references to the Schlieffen Plan operation, made a forced landing in Belgium and was captured. It was not known where he had been able to burn the papers he carried. As a result, it had to be assumed that the British and French knew the German plan.

General von Manstein had opposed the Schlieffen operation and had proposed a breakthrough in the center near Sedan with strong armored and motorized forces. As a result of the capture of the plans previously decided upon, the Manstein scheme was adopted instead. One of the reasons for its success was the conviction of the French and British generals that the Schlieffen Plan was being attempted. When the Germans attacked, the bulk of the British and French forces were moved north into Belgium and the Germans broke through into the denuded rear.

Dunkirk, according to Guderian, could have been captured easily before the British reached the coast. Guderian's armor was held back by orders from Hitler to leave Dunkirk to Goering's Luftwaffe. The German Air Force was unable to prevent the evacuation. Guderian believes that the only chance of reaching an accommodation with Great Britain was lost as the result of the successful evacuation from Dunkirk which was, in effect, a moral victory, if a military defeat.

The narratives of the campaigns in which Guderian participated are given in more detail than is of interest to the general reader. They are accompanied by outline maps which are little more than printed overlays. The military student will find them valuable to study the campaigns, provided he has suitable maps on which to plot the operations.

Guderian's relations with Hitler, and his descriptions of his conferences with the half madman who ruled Germany, form the most interesting story in the book. Hitler distrusted the German generals. He knew that Hindenberg and Ludendorff had forced the abdication of the Kaiser in 1918, when it became apparent that Germany could not win the war and that Germany could be saved only by making peace. Hitler also knew that in the higher military levels, the generals had studied the problem of forcing the end of a war for the benefit of the nation when its continuance no longer gave hope of profit. As a consequence, he was perpetually suspicious of all his military subordinates. Hitler encouraged the development of the Waffen SS as a sort of palace guard. It eventually became a force of 35 divisions, but as it fought with the Army, it turned more and more to identify itself with the armed forces and eventually it also came under Hitlers suspicion.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Throughout the war there was constant conflict between the Army General Staff and the Armed Forces General Staff. This was encouraged by Hitler in his effort to keep the armed forces from forming a united front which might be turned against him. At the end of the war, when Guderian became Chief of the Army Staff, he was responsible solely, with Hitler, for the conduct of the Russian war, while the Armed Forces Staff under Field Marshal Keitel was responsible for the European front. Although theoretically subordinated to the Armed Forces General Staff, the Air Force and the Navy were practically independent.

The opportunity to take over the Mediterranean was presented to Hitler after the successful campaign of 1940 in the West. This would have been a relatively simple military problem. He then could have joined the French, Italian and German fleets, and with surface forces of this magnitude could have starved out Great Britain. But Hitler already had his eyes on the conquest of Russia and dismissed the Mediterranean operation with scant and inadequate consideration.

This was one of the many opportunities when Germany could have won the war. In almost every case it was Hitler's personal decision that lost the chance. To the better class of German officer of whom Guderian is representative, going to war at all was a disaster and the war was tragedy. Guderian and the others did what they thought was their duty as soldiers, forgetful of the higher duty they owed the nation.

IMPORTANT EXPLORATION

THE PROCESS OF ECONOMIC GROWTH, by W. W. Rostow (Norton; $4.50).

THIS IS an economists' book, but it discusses ideas that should interest everyone. Americans have awakened to the fact that the rapid economic growth to which they are accustomed is an unusual phenomenon. Nations of Western Europe have until recently suffered from a retardation in the output of goods and services per capita. Two-thirds of the world's people live in lands where the industrial revolution has never found a suitable cultural climate. Can the United States itself expect to continue its rapid material gains?

Since the early classical economists, the process of economic growth has been slighted by the professionals. Adam Smith had much to say about it, but most of his followers have concentrated on the operation of a price and profit system within a theoretically static order tacitly accepted as universal and eternal. Even the students of the business cycle, though their field of vision is somewhat broader, usually assume a business order as we have recently known it.

Economists have, of course, recognized that growth occurs, though sporadically, and have assigned numerous reasons for it like the progress of invention, but most of them have regarded such forces as outside the range of their theoretical province. These "exogenous" developments, it is acknowledged, upset the equilibria of their theoretical formulations, but are not themselves analyzed as part of a conceivably rational universe.

Mr. Rostow is one of the pioneering thinkers who have begun to try to make sense out of economic growth itself, leaving aside for the moment the intricacies of short-run analysis. He tentatively sets forth the hypothesis that six "propensities" may form the basis of a logical account of the process—the propensities to develop fundamental science, to apply science to economic ends, to accept the possibilities of innovation, to seek material advance, to consume, and to have children. For example, in the administration of President Truman's Point 4, it is a major difficulty that many cultures which strongly exhibit the sixth propensity lack the first three, sometimes the fourth, and occasionally even the fifth. There is nothing new about the idea that forces of this sort condition economic growth; what is new is the attempt to set them in order with the purpose of weaving them into an elegant, clear and internally consistent logical system.

The cultural propensities are not to be explained mainly in economic terms, though they may react on one another and on other aspects of the society through economic mechanisms. They thus could form a nexus between economics and the other social sciences. Aside from such basic considerations there is need for economists themselves to explore more carefully the long-term tendencies hitherto left mainly to the conjectures of historians.

How far have the economic wastes of war been counterbalanced by the stimulus to growth or the shifts in development which wars have brought? What is the setting of the alternate periods of extensive and intensive investment, first developing new areas and then expanding older industrial centers? What is to be learned from the uneven development of regions, or of industries within a region? Are not the long term trends of prices of individual commodities or groups of commodities fully as significant as those of broad price averages? These are some of the questions that Mr. Rostow raises and that he begins to answer.

Questions of this sort are far more pertinent to the contemporary problems set by war and defense economies, Eupean recovery, the effort to introduce modern technology in underdeveloped regions, and the need to find a viable new pattern for world trade, than are the neo-classical formulations or even the revisions in them made by Keynesian theory.

Great changes in man's economic environment have in the past stimulated new orientations of economic thinking. The present situation, which shifts emphasis to planning and policy for the long term on a world scale, emphasizes the need for a viable theory of growth and social change. This field has been too long dominated by the inadequate theory of Karl Marx and his followers. The naive preoccupations of those who oppose to this doctrine the program of "preserving" a static and automatically functioning regime of free enterprise obviously will not do. Mr. Rostow is engaged in exploration of the very first importance. GEORGE SOULE

Mr. Soule's new book, Ideas of the Great Economists, is being published by the Viking Press and is scheduled to appear in October.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MATERIALS AND WEIGHTS OF HERMANN MELVILLE

MOBY-DICK, by Hermann Melville, edited Luther S. Mansfield and Howard P. Vincent (Hermitage House; $5).

THE SPIRIT ABOVE THE DUST, by Ronald Mason (Lehmann; 18/—).

MELVILLE'S QUARREL WITH GOD, by Lawrence Thompson (Princeton; $6).

I HAVE ADDED Mr. Ronald Mason's book to the two books I was asked to review for the *New Republic* simply because its intelligence and limpidity measures the soddenness of the scholarship of the new edition of *Moby-Dick* and the perverseness of thinking in *Melville's Quarrel with God*. But more than that: Mr. Mason's book is the triumph of the several books which have tried to throw light on Melville's work with the foot-candle of rationalism, that series of critiques which can be said to start with John Freeman's biography, to include Mr. Mumford's more troubled rationalism, and to run the list of the bead-telling books of the last years: Mathiessen's, Sedgwick's, Chase's, Arvin's, and Brooks' — perhaps Yvor Winters' and Auden's *The Enchafèd Flood*—in other words, a rosary of praise which has (with some quietness and a little decency) been the private act of these men.

I am at some pains to see the story of Melville critique and scholarship whole, and set it before you, just because there is now so much of it: his importance is so crucial that some sharpness, and an effort at a discrimination of the present state of the knowledge of it, seems to me to be called for. For example: face to face with such a monster as this new edition of *Moby-Dick*, its stomach gurgitating 250 pages of footnotes—probably in quantity the equal of the actual pages of the text itself, I toyed with the notion of using this space to try to establish Some Principles Toward a Correct Editing of Moby-Dick, as severe a list of such simple demands as, say, George Lyman Kittredge might have expected from anybody doing a book on Chaucer. You yourself would feel this validity of old-fashioned scholarship if you had to grapple with the pretentiousness, the ignorance, and the intolerable ill-proportion of this work of two highly placed professors.

Or, confronted by this other sort of professor, Thompson (a newer member of the Melville lobby), I was tempted to write an essay for you on *Clarel*, that thorough thing in which that most serious man Melville tried, almost with his hands gone, to expose to any American's view in 1876 the worsening of the society of the West and the struggle of himself, in the midst of it, to keep

> Faith (who from the scrawl indignant turns)
> With blood warm oozing from her wounded trust
> Inscribes even on her shards of broken urns
> The sign of the cross—the spirit above the dust!

The fact which you would not believe is, that this Mr. Thompson has written a 450-page book on the subject of Melville and God—and has given only four pages to *Clarel*!

In my quandary, a friend happened to put Mr. Mason's book in my hands; and its decency, its seriousness and the deftness of its proportion (in this respect I'd guess the most considered of all the critiques—I happen also to like, myself, Geoffrey Stone's *Melville*, though his engagement, from a Catholic position, makes for an easier ordering than Mr. Mason's less positioned spiritual one) made it possible for me to feel less burdened. And I was free to try to do two other things; to bring the total Melville picture into some sort of focus, and to offer whatever insights five additional years of work of my own might bring to correct or add to the measurement of Melville I offered in *Call Me Ishmael*.

The very badness of the two American books under review does oblige a man to call attention to such exceptional biographical scholarship as Jay Leyda's in his *Melville's Log* (I have not yet read Leon Howard's biography), to Harrison Hayford's work (still, I believe, an unpublished dissertation), to Henry A. Murray's continuing application of developed psychological tools to the question of the nature of Melville's personality, to manuscript scholarship of the usableness of F. Barron Freeman's edition of *Billy Budd*, and to the scrupulous steady study of Melville's library and his reading that Merton Sealts has been engaged in for better than ten years. These are men whose work I know and can respect—can encourage any of you to turn to, who want to add such knowledges to the experience of the reading of Melville's books.

Two others I might mark: Miss Wright, whose book, *Melville's Use of the Bible*, goes a very great way to help to right perhaps the most prevalent error of contemporary Melville critique—the tendency of it to exaggerate the New Testament and Christ as against the less conscious attention Melville gave the Old Testament as a source for himself (he went, it might be useful to remind a contemporary reader, to Judeo-Christianity as Picasso has said he went to the Communist Party—to draw from it, as women go to the fountain of the town to draw water for the daily uses of their family). A man whose work on *Clarel* I only know by snatches, Walter Bezanson, once readers have the old-fashioned concentration of mind Melville had, and had the nerve to write to, will show itself to be much more the true other weight to *Moby-Dick* of Melville's involvement with Judeo-Christian values than *Billy Budd*. You can expect *Clarel*, in fact, soon to have attention, as *The Confidence-Man* is now receiving its first attention—Melville's most considered examination of the second of his three great sources, America, the experiment of these States. So just as Mr. Chase gave the latter a fair go, Mr. Mason has given *Clarel* the beginning of its due.

Which leaves me with my tribe of men—and the chance to go a little free, and come to Melville. For now I can single out Raymond Weaver, can think about Hart Crane's amorous uses of Melville's *Billy Budd* and *Moby-Dick* (evidence of Robert Creeley's important observation that Crane had literally no other device in life than poetry, and when he thought poetry had failed him, or he had failed it, he killed himself). I can continue to trouble myself about a most different using of Mel-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ville—Edward Dahlberg's, in *Do These Bones Live*. I can also ask myself why William Carlos Williams has always drawn a blank on Melville; interested in the conundrum, as I am, because of a like care to Melville's with which Williams has devoted himself, from the *American Grain* on, to the nature of the American consciousness. Williams is like Melville, a man who registers the going-ons of all of the human beings he lives among. He sees charge in them, worth in their fires, also a fire his own burns in, as against Ezra Pound, with that selection out of, that "the light in the conversations of—the letters of—the intelligent ones," or at least the literate ones).

And I can end this whole first part of the job I wanted to do for you—give the focus its proper depth—by not letting you or myself forget what these editors of *Moby-Dick* have so outrageously neglected to mention, that the man who more and more stands up as the one man of this century to be put with Melville, Dostoevsky and Rimbaud (men who engaged themselves with modern reality in such fierceness and pity as to be of real use to any of us who want to take on the post-modern) is D. H. Lawrence. He wrote two chapters on Melville in his *Studies in Classic American Literature* which, although they are not the equal of his Whitman chapters, are worth, to men of soul, what Melville's own words are worth.

It is those words in those novels in prose and verse, from 1846 to 1891, I propose to lead you back to. And I propose to do it by what I have found the most valuable thing in all three of these new Melville books under review, a passage from Goethe's *Dichtung und Wahrheit* which Melville is known to have read at the time he was conceiving the character of Ahab and the shape of the Whale. The crazy part of it is that it is just these two egregious editors, Vincent and Mansfield, who have brought it to light! CHARLES OLSON

[This is the first of two essays on the work of Melville, by Mr. Olson, poet, critic and Guggenheim fellow, who is the author of *Call Me Ishmael*, a critique of Melville.—The Editors.]

A CHRISTIAN ORIENTATION

PERSONALISM, by Emmanuel Mounier, translated by Philip Mairet (Grove Press; $3.50).

IN 1932 EMMANUEL MOUNIER, impatient with an academic career scarcely underway, and disquieted by the social and spiritual disorders of the time, launched the review *Esprit*. From its first appearance (Mounier was 27 at the time), *Esprit* has been a laboratory for intensive investigation into the fundamental philosophical, social and cultural issues of our time, the rallying point for an effort to lay the theoretical foundations of new social structures, and a means for molding the thought of the philosophical movement called "personalism." Until his death in 1950, Mounier was the guiding intellect, the driving and co-ordinating force behind the review, and the leading theoretician of contemporary French personalism—a form of existentialism generally of Christian orientation (though Mounier, himself a Catholic for whom his Christian belief was of central importance), has pointed out that a personalist viewpoint can be held by a non-Christian.

It was largely through the pages of *Esprit* that Mounier's leading ideas were forged. The book reviewed here, published in France only a few months before the author's death, and now made available in English translation, contains a compact restatement of his positions.

Indicating that the roots of personalism can be traced back to early Christian thought, the author sketches its more immediate lineage, which includes such names as Pascal, Maine de Biran, and Kierkegaard.

Sharply critical of capitalism and "bourgeois individualism," and in agreement with Marxism as to the necessity for removing the economic causes of man's "alienation," Mounier insists nevertheless that this alienation proceeds from spiritual, as well as economic

Heaven Pays No Dividends

by RICHARD KAUFMANN

Out of postwar Germany comes a new voice!— a wry and moving story of love, despair, and hope

With its strikingly un-Teutonic lightness and humor, this novel speaks to the fifties as *All Quiet on the Western Front* spoke to the twenties, and carries a similar shock of revelation. This is what it was really like for a disillusioned young German in these years—growing up, falling in love, going to war, and returning to face a chaotic future.

"Readable and real, humorous and human and bitter and gay all together." — GEORGE HOWE, author of *Call It Treason*. $3.50

"Wonderfully engaging." —*Saturday Review*

THE VIKING PRESS • 18 East 48th St., New York 17, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disorder. Though agreeing with atheistic existentialists of the Heidegger-Sartre tradition on the "creative force of rupture" and the importance of individual decision and choice, he accuses them of positioning an isolated individual in a hostile world, and of rejecting love, communication, responsibility.

This movement is dialectical: the person moves between the poles of withdrawal and engagement, meditation and action, rupture and adherence. The withdrawal, the meditation, the rupture permit the discovery and consolidation of personal identity and of moral strength. But these acts of "*interiorisation*" are not abstentions from the world; they are themselves preparations for engagement.

The doctrine of engagement is central to Mounier's philosophy; though personalism cannot *determine* any particular line of political or social action, its values must influence the choice and direction of such action. The personalist theory of engagement requires that social action not only be efficacious but be impregnated with spiritual values. Mounier had criticized an early tendency on the part of himself and the *Esprit* group toward such great concern with ethical purity as to risk falling into an ineffective, even dangerous, Utopianism. Though insisting on the validity of the early position in its basic outlines, he felt that he and his group has not sufficiently understood that efficacy itself can have a spiritual value. In the present book, he reaffirms the necessity for both spiritual value and efficacy in all social action and sketches a theory of the dialectical relationship between the two. But he insists that we *are* engaged, that choices must be made; and he finds that the very creative force of engagement results from a "*tension féconde*" generated between the imperfection of the cause and absolute fidelity to "personalist" values.

An increased sense of relativity is also to be seen in Mounier's approach to the structures of a new socialism. With a view to protecting the human person and "natural communities"—such as the family, religious groups, etc.—from the weight of oppressive and impersonal organization, *Esprit* had, in its early years, elaborated a theory of a radically decentralized and pluralistic state, which would have sharply delimited powers and would act essentially as a co-ordinating agency for autonomous economic, judicial, educational bodies. In the present book, though Mounier still talks of non-state-controlled socialization of certain vital sectors of the economy, and of a decentralized state with limited powers, integrated into a pluralistic society, he questions whether the state itself can be "pluralized," and displays a much more pragmatic attitude toward the problems of socialism.

Mounier had wanted above all to "bear witness" to the plight of his time. In one respect, he bore witness not as a prophet, but as the victim of one of its most agonizing dilemmas—that of the man-of-good-will, the man of the non-Communist Left in contemporary Europe. Strongly opposed to Stalinism, he nevertheless contained his "dialogue" with the Communists, feeling that an out-and-out anti-Communism would betray the French working classes in the Communist camp, and nurturing the vain hope that the "new collectivisms" of the East might somehow be impregnated with democratic values and might alter their iron-clad form. But the debate became more and more a *dialogue de sourds*, and after Prague, the Rajk trial, Yugoslavia, Mounier's condemnation of Stalinism became more and more severe. Just before his death, he was seeking avenues for a new movement of the non-Stalinist Left. IRVING S. JAFFE

WHAT IS ATONALITY?

by Robert Evett

THE DANUBE, that Swannee River of the twelve tone school, has overflowed again, and threatens to engulf us all. In Paris, London and New York, an intelligentsia which only a few years ago despised German Romanticism in its every form, now seems to want to be carried back to Old Vienna, the Vienna of Schoenberg and Alban Berg.

As Dada stressed the importance of frivolity in art, Schoenbergians have always been concerned with the intensity of personal expression. Schoenberg was always proud of his intimate collaboration with the Almighty, who, it seems, provided him with inspiration, stayed his hand when he had "taken the red pencil of the censor," ordered him on the hard but royal path, from time to time presented him with gifts "subconsciously received" and finally landed him in space where, "as in Swedenborg's heaven . . . there is no absolute down, no right or left, forward or backward." Schoenberg's beatific vision has come to be known as atonality.

As a word, atonality has very little meaning. It was probably conjured up by some irate critic to indicate that, at least in his mind, the work of Schoenberg and his students was so foreign to common, academic practice that it had no meaning, no organization, and showed no control. It is true that, around 1908, the school which was to be known later as twelve-tone was in a stage of highly empirical experimentation, but its music seems much less extreme to us now than it did to its contemporary audience. When the Viennese school was forming, Schoenberg himself felt a close kinship with Debussy and Bartok, and he never could understand why the public did not subscribe to his innovations as quickly as it did to theirs. As he said:

Form in the arts, and especially in music, aims primarily at comprehensibility. . . . Composition in the twelve tones has no other aim than comprehensibility. In view of recent events in musical history, this might seem astonishing, for works written in this style have failed to gain understanding in spite of the new medium of organization.

BOOK PUBLISHING

Looking for a PUBLISHER?

Learn about our special plan whereby your book can be published, promoted and distributed on a professional basis. All types of manuscripts invited. New authors welcome. Write for Booklet RP today. It's free.
VANTAGE PRESS, 120 W. 31 St., New York 1.
In Calif.: 6356 Hollywood Blvd., Hollywood 28.

PERSONAL

exit loneliness

Somewhere there is someone you would like to know. Somewhere there is someone who would like to know you. We can help you find a richer, happier life through discreet, dignified 'social introductions.' *Write for booklet, or phone*
MAY RICHARDSON
Dept. N.R., 111 West 72 Street
New York City EN 2-2033

PRINTED BY NATIONAL PUBLISHING CO., 301 N. ST., N. E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The esthestic contributions of Schoenberg and his followers can be divided conveniently into those which represent only an extension of past practices and those which seem genuinely new. In its expressive phase, what is called atonal music does not differ greatly from the accomplishment of Wagner in *Tristan.* It will be remembered that instead of writing recognizable tunes which could be developed in an aria style, Wagner wrote long, almost endless lines in which the word was almost as important as the music that projected it.

Wagner wanted to make every word completely coherent in itself, and subordinated musical inflection to verbal requirements. In the second act of Tristan, the listener finds climax after climax, all leading directly into each other, with little sense of finality or repose.

The Wagnerian method of building a climax was generally to start low, introduce a rich profusion of dissonance, and grow higher and higher in pitch. It can take a great deal of time to build such a climax. The Schoenbergians, in 1908, foreshortened the process, so that high could follow low within a fraction of a second, and dissonance exist without a contrived relationship to consonance. At this time, their pieces rarely lasted more than a minute or so. It is during this period that their music, based as it was on Wagnerian intensity emancipated from both time and the spoken word, seems least organized by conventional canons, but as a matter of fact, it represents only an alteration of tradition. Later work, particularly that of Berg, as represented by *Wozzeck* or the *Lyric Suite* or the Violin Concreto, shows a return to the older Wagnerian method. *Wozzeck* is more dissonant than *Tristan,* but it is not much less tuneful. The *Lyric Suite* is essentially the same kind of writing, but the absence of words gives it a greater flexibility and makes it more active. Since Berg represents the right wing of the Schoenberg school, it is natural that his work should demonstrate its peculiarities in a more or less traditional context. His music continues to provide conventional listeners with easy access to what they like to think of as atonal sounds.

The special contribution of Schoenberg was what he called a *Method of Composing with Twelve Tones Which Are Related Only with One Another.* It is futile to argue that Matthias Hauer or Berg perfected this method before the good Lord gave it to Schoenberg, because it was Schoenberg who gave it its philosophy, best stated in his observation that: "*The unity of musical space demands an absolute and unitary perception.*" By implication, this is a perception of the materials from which a piece of music is to be made, absolved from their habit of progressing through time, or of occupying a specific register.

Schoenberg taught that music should be constructed from a single unit, the twelve tone row, which did not lose its characteristics though the notes in it might be played forwards, backwards, upside down, jammed together simultaneously, or disjointed spacially. This doctrine is the heart of his teaching; for him, it was an infallible method of attaining unity. It is entirely separate from broader notions of formal structure, into which it may well be introduced. The teaching that this basic unit must be composed of twelve distinct and separate tones is only a flexible corollary to the view itself. Schoenberg's method allows great latitude in the employment of the basic unit, which, once it has been established, is immediately related to the problems of time and space which music ordinarily poses. However, the taboo against unvaried repetition (which the twelve-tone writers like to impose upon themselves) must lead to a music which is in a more or less constant state of flux.

Since Schoenberg admits that this constant activity does not produce conventional stability and is, indeed, designed to replace old order with a new approach to unity, perhaps the word "atonal" does describe his method adequately. In my experience, however, it applies better to the theory than to the result.

Arnold Schoenberg felt that, in his *Third Quartet,* he had reached a final emancipation from the past. For me, at least, this work not only borrows form from Classical antiquity; its harmonic method is heavily rooted in an older tradition which constantly transcends the twelve-tone ideas from which its themes are derived. As Schoenberg grew older and his method became more versatile, he came to use it more and more as a means of Romantic expression; his figurations were frequently borrowed from Chopin and Liszt, and only the notes were changed. The opening of his late Piano Concerto is little more than an old-fashioned waltz, and a very schmaltzy one at that.

People who are beginning to find Schoenberg a little obvious and old hat are gratified to find a more challenging complexity in the work of Anton von Webern, whose music shows little of the heavy hand of tradition. If Webern wanted to destroy our Western conventions, he must yield the palm to two young Americans who have, at last, finally destroyed tonal control by introducing the element of chance into music on a hitherto unknown scale. Naturally, as long as Mischa Elman continues to play the violin or the Metropolitan Opera keeps its present staff, this element will not be likely to disappear from our stages; the listener will always be teased by the occasional sour note or the wildly inaccurate entrance which can help make listening an adventure.

Morton Feldman, however, has now invented a music in which accuracy of pitch plays no part; it is written on graph paper, so that the performer will never be tempted to play the same notes in two successive performances. To a Schoenbergian, this seems like a frivolous extreme, but it can be justified by the old philosophical notion that it is impossible to step into the same river twice. In his *Fugue for Twelve Radios,* John Cage has arrived at a true and undeniable atonality. The sound produced by twelve radios tuned simultaneously to different stations cannot very well be controlled.

For the time being, I would suggest that atonality might be defined as music over which the composer exercises no control in point of pitch. The *Method of Composing with Twelve Tones* belongs to the older tradition.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OVER 1,500 THINKING AMERICANS

have already subscribed to

the next 13 issues

of

New Republic

and the 12 page pamphlet

on

ADLAI STEVENSON – The man and his views . . .

all for only $1.00

The *New Republic's* reprint, "Stevenson—A Summary of His Views," has now been enlarged into a 12-page pamphlet with coated cover. There have been added Richard A. Meyer's brief and illuminating biography, "Adlai Stevenson—Growth of a Man," and the *New Republic's* widely acclaimed editorial, "Toward the Great Tomorrows."

To receive this first and most comprehensive campaign document FREE and the next 13 issues of the *New Republic,* simply attach a ONE DOLLAR BILL to the order form below, fill in your name and mail to the address given.

Or, if you are already a subscriber and would like copies of the STEVENSON pamphlet for distribution to friends or fellow-members of organizations, you may order at the low bulk prices given in the lower left-hand corner.

"If Stevenson and Eisenhower are true to themselves, the 1952 campaign can be as memorable and constructive as the debates of Roosevelt, Wilson and Taft in 1912." The *New Republic* will bring to its readers throughout this campaign fresh enlightenment and informed interpretation. To make sure that you receive every issue, SUBSCRIBE.

BULK REPRINT PRICES:

50 copies	$4
100 copies	$6
200 copies	$11
500 copies	$25
1000 copies	$45

(All prices cover postage)

Write for terms on larger quantities or specially printed editions.

CUT

NEW REPUBLIC • 40 E. 49 ST. • NEW YORK 17, N.Y.

☐ For the attached one dollar please send me 13 weeks of the New Republic and the Stevenson reprint free.

☐ For the enclosed $..... please send me ..... copies of the Stevenson reprint.

NAME The Charles C. Sherrod Library

ADDRESS EAST TENNESSEE STATE COLLEGE Johnson City, Tennessee

CITY ..... ZONE ..... STATE .....

9-8-52

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED